

**REMARKS**

**I. Formalities**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents submitted on January 23, 2004.

However, the Examiner did not indicate whether the Formal Drawings filed on July 7, 2003 are accepted. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge and approve the aforementioned Formal Drawings.

**II. Status of the Application**

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-16. Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claims 1 and 14-16 being in independent form. Claims 1-16 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,618,553 to Shiohara (hereinafter “Shiohara”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-16 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Shiohara.

**A. Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites (among other things):

A memory card that is provided independent  
of a printing apparatus... said memory card  
comprising:

process information... and

information for allowing visual confirmation  
of a change in an image that is caused by said  
processing.

Thus, claim 1 is plainly directed to a memory card. In stark contrast to the recitations of claim 1, Shiohara relates to a digital camera. Further, the recording medium for recording the image data that comprises Shiohara's digital camera, does not correspond to "a memory card," as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Shiohara for *at least* these reasons.

Claim 1 also recites:

...a printing apparatus having a processor  
that performs predetermined processing with  
respect to image data based on information read  
from said memory card...

Contrary to the recitations of claim 1, Shiohara discloses that the processing of image data is performed by the control means 430 of the digital camera 100. Column 5, lines 1-6. In particular, Shiohara discloses that the digital camera 100 comprises a printer driver 53, which has the same configuration as a printer driver for preparing print data in a BC. Column 7, lines 40-43. Therefore, Shiohara discloses that processing of image data is performed by a digital camera and not by a printing apparatus. As a result, Shiohara does not disclose, and cannot possibly

suggest, the feature of a printing apparatus having a processor that performs predetermined processing with respect to image data, as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Shiohara for *at least* these additional reasons. Moreover, the dependent claims 2-13 are patentable over Shiohara *at least* by virtue of their dependency. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

**B. Independent Claim 14**

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 14 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 14. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**C. Independent Claim 15**

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 15 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 15. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**D. Independent Claim 16**

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 16 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 16. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Taska/

---

Andrew J. Taska  
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 18, 2007